

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of Claims 1-37 indicated in the Examiner's Action of November 23, 2005, and thank the Examiner for the allowance. Claims 1-38 are currently pending in the present application with Claims 1, 23, 33, 34, 36 and 38 in independent form. Claim 38 has been rejected as discussed below and has been amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claim 38.

Rejection of Claim 38 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 38 has been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,317,320 issued to Cosley et al. (hereinafter "Cosley"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 38 as being anticipated by Cosley pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for the reasons given below.

Claim 38 has been amended herein and is directed to a method of cooling equipment components disposed in a rack, the components being disposed above one another in the rack and including fans to draw air from first sides of the components through the components and to expel the drawn-in air from opposite second sides of the components to achieve side-to-side airflow. The method comprises drawing air from a first region external to and near a front of the rack with at least one fan disposed in an air path defined by one or more walls disposed within an internal chamber of a rack-mounted air distribution unit housing, the at least one fan and the air path configured to guide the drawn-in air along the air path and to force the drawn-in air from the air path to a side region along a side of the rack; guiding the air into the front of the rack and into a second region along the air path; and forcing the drawn-in air with the at least one fan laterally from the second region to the side region along the side of the rack to provide cooling air from which the equipment components may draw to achieve side-to-side airflow.

Applicants respectfully submit Cosley does not disclose each and every element of Claim 38, and, in particular, does not disclose at least the limitation of *drawing air from a first region external to and near a front of the rack with at least one fan disposed in an air path defined by one or more walls disposed within an internal chamber of a rack-mounted air distribution unit housing, the at least one fan and the air path*

configured to guide the drawn-in air along the air path and to force the drawn-in air from the air path to a side region along a side of the rack.

In contrast to Claim 38, Cosley does not disclose drawing air from a first region near a front of the rack using at least one fan disposed in an air path defined by one or walls disposed within an internal chamber of a rack-mounted air distribution unit housing. In particular, Cosley does not disclose at least one fan disposed in such an air path with the fan and the air path configured to guide the drawn-in air along the air path.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that with respect to at least this limitation, the method of Claim 38 is patentably distinguishable from the cooling system of Cosley. Claim 38 therefore is not anticipated by Cosley. According, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 38 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Based upon the foregoing amendments and discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and an action to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Carol H. Peters

Registration No. 45,010

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS

GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

One Financial Center

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

Telephone: 617/348-4914

Facsimile: 617/542-2241

email: chpeters@mintz.com

Date: February 23, 2006